

18 AUG 1972

**The Washington Merry-Go-Round**

# Hanoi Signals Viewed Not Serious

**By Jack Anderson**

We have had access to classified documents which shed new light on the controversy over whether President Nixon "missed" an opportunity to end the Vietnam War in 1969.

The North Vietnamese sent out several signals after the 1968 election that they were willing to make peace with the new Nixon administration. These ranged from guarded messages to military pullbacks.

The messages, some more vague than others, reached Washington through a variety of channels. But more impressive was the withdrawal of 22 of 25 regiments from the two northernmost provinces of South Vietnam.

The key to the controversy lies in the interpretation of these moves. The new President chose not to regard the messages as serious peace overtures. He also interpreted the withdrawal of the 22 regiments as a military redeployment rather than a political signal.

The minutes of a secret White House meeting on Oct. 28, 1969, summarize the Nixon attitude. Speaking for the President, Henry Kissinger declared:

"We have mentioned 'cease-fire' (to Hanoi) in various connotations. If they want a reasonable compromise, we will meet them half-way. If they insist on American humiliation, we will resist."

He held out hope the North Vietnamese, despite louder growlings from Hanoi, would come to terms. "The Hanoi tactics are the use of unbridled ferocity," Kissinger said, "until just before they are ready to settle."

He outlined a two-track strategy for peace. "The rapid road would be negotiation," he said, "the slow road Vietnamization."

## Slow Road

President Nixon has traveled the slow road. His intelligence estimates warned that a Communist takeover in South Vietnam was inevitable. His Vietnamization policy, therefore, was aimed at delaying it, not avoiding it.

The President was determined to hold off the day the Communists took power in Saigon, we must conclude, for his own political reasons. He simply didn't want the Communists in control of the south while he was running for re-election in 1972.

He had reason to regard Communist control more as a political problem for himself than a serious menace to the U.S. For at the time of his inauguration, the National Intelligence Estimate was cautiously optimistic about the effects of a Communist takeover.

There would be damage, according to the estimate, to U.S. prestige and credibility among other Southeast Asian

nations. But the document stressed:

"While some Southeast Asian leaders would probably entertain doubts about the will of the U.S. to play a security role in the area, we do not believe that they would be panicked into precipitate changes in policy or posture."

Instead, the document predicted these leaders would take a wait-and-see stance.

The estimate also offered a virtual point-by-point rebuttal of the so-called "domino theory" which the Johnson administration had so often used as its rationalization for continuing the war.

The document declared, for example, that Hanoi no doubt hopes to extend its control over Laos and Cambodia but would probably bide its time.

"They might fear some risk of a new U.S. military response," it was suggested. "Moreover, Hanoi would be preoccupied for a time at least with the formidable task of consolidating Communist rule in South Vietnam."

The estimate gave this forecast about relations between Hanoi and Peking in the event of a Communist triumph in the south:

"It is possible . . . that the two countries would draw closer together . . . It seems more likely, however, that Hanoi would wish to take the opportunity to establish quite clearly its independence of the Chinese, relying on continued

Soviet and available Free World" assistance.

The document said Peking could be expected to beat the propaganda drums over the expansion of Communist control. But it added significantly: "Current Chinese strategy does not appear to call for overt aggression, and we do not foresee a change in this strategy."

As for Moscow, the document predicted: "The Soviet Union is not likely to become a major supporter of Communist subversion in Southeast Asia after Vietnam."

The CIA's Office of National Estimates concurred in 1969 that if Saigon fell, "North Vietnam would consume itself in Laos and South Vietnam. Only Laos would definitely follow into the Communist orbit."

This would leave Southeast Asia, in the CIA's opinion, "just as it is at least for another generation."

Whatever the intelligence assessment, however, President Nixon's political assessment was that he couldn't afford to lose South Vietnam to the Communists before the 1972 election.

Perhaps he is right that the "rapid road" to peace, via negotiation, was illusory. But the "slow road," which he elected to take, has cost more than 15,000 American lives since he took office.

© 1972, United Feature Syndicate

TOPEKA, KAN.  
JOURNAL

E - 28,802

FEB 8 1972

## One of the great Kremlin-watchers

Of all the people who have served the United States in ambassadorial tough jobs around the world, the name of Llewellyn E. Thompson has earned an indelible place in modern history.

Where the situation demanded firmness, Thompson used quiet persuasion and proved it just as effective a weapon in the diplomatic pouch in dealing with the inner circles of foreign nations.

That this was so workable with the Soviet Union, where nothing short of shouting and bullying would seem to put an adversary at equal advantage, is high tribute to Thompson's expertise in cool statesmanship.

IT WAS IN MOSCOW, in three different hitches, that the former Colorado boy who died Sunday at 67 spent 11 of his 40 years in the diplomatic service. His success in negotiating with the Russians is acknowledged as unmatched by any other envoy since relations between the two governments were established in 1933.

He received numerous awards for his service, and U.S. policy toward the Communist bloc has been largely shaped by his devotion to the challenges assigned him. While there have been many rough spots in the Washington-Kremlin competition for world leadership over the years, it is significant that none has erupted into more serious conflict than has occurred.

Thompson no doubt earned respect from the Russians in his initial assignment to that country. He went there in 1940 after several minor posts abroad. In

the early days of World War II, when the German war machine was threatening Moscow, Thompson stayed on even though most of the diplomatic corps followed the fleeing Soviet government under siege.

After 1944 he filled posts in London, in the State Dept. at Washington and at Rome, then in 1952 was appointed high commissioner to occupied Austria by President Truman.

Credited to his negotiating skills while in Vienna were the 1954 agreement on the partition of Trieste and the 1955 treaty ending the four-power occupation of Austria, both of which involved Russian resistance to easy solutions.

Thompson became the first U.S. ambassador to independent and neutral Austria. But before his active career was out, he represented the U.S. for seven more critical years in Moscow. He was on especially friendly terms with Nikita Khrushchev, and later expressed disappointment with the Khrushchev successors in the Kremlin.

WHEN THOMPSON RETIRED in 1969, he had served six U.S. presidents and secured recognition as one of Washington's exclusive quartet of "Kremlinologists." The others are Charles E. Bohlen, George F. Kennan and Foy D. Kohler.

Until recently, Thompson served the Nixon administration as a consultant in the SALT talks with the Soviets over arms curtailment, was active in the mutual funds business and on the CIA's Board of National Estimates.

As Secretary of State William P. Rogers has noted in his sincere words of eulogy, the country has lost a wise and faithful counselor.